

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ROSS DANIEL WALKER,

Case No. 1:22-cv-00466-AWI-SKO

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE  
ACTION SHOULD NOT BE  
RECOMMENDED FOR DISMISSAL**

(Doc. 7)

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES, et al.,

**THIRTY DAY DEADLINE**

Defendants.

Plaintiff Ross Daniel Walker is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this action. (See Doc. 6.) Plaintiff filed his complaint in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York on April 11, 2022. (Doc. 1). The case was transferred, *sua sponte*, to this Court on April 19, 2022. (See Doc. 4.)

On May 24, 2022, the Court issued an order finding that Plaintiff's complaint failed to state any cognizable claims and granting leave for Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within thirty days. (Doc. 7.) To date, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or requested an extension of time in which to do so.

The Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, corresponding with Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, provide, "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the

1 Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 110.  
 2 “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court  
 3 may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los*  
 4 *Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based  
 5 on a party’s failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with  
 6 local rules. *See, e.g., Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for  
 7 failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*,  
 8 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson*  
 9 *v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply  
 10 with local rules).

11 **Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause, within thirty (30) days of the date**  
 12 **of service of this Order, why a recommendation should not issue for this action to be dismissed**  
 13 **for Plaintiff’s failure comply with the Court’s order and for failure to prosecute his case.**  
 14 Alternatively, within that same time period, Plaintiff may file an amended complaint or a notice of  
 15 voluntary dismissal. The Court further CAUTIONS Plaintiff that, if he fails to take action within  
 16 thirty (30) days of the date of service of this order, the Court will recommend to the presiding district  
 17 court judge that this action be dismissed, in its entirety.

18 The Court DIRECTS the Clerk of Court to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at his address  
 19 listed on the docket for this matter.

20  
 21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: July 11, 2022

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE